

President Bush doesn't understand that American families are tired of just talk. They want action. He's done nothing for four years to help, and now he wants another chance. He doesn't deserve it. JOHN KERRY offers real solutions, not excuses and empty promises. It's time for a change.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have spoken with the two leaders. I ask unanimous consent that following the 15 minutes in morning business for the Republicans, which has already been allotted, there be a half hour of additional morning business equally divided between both sides. There will be no who is first. It will be whoever gets the floor during that time. An additional half hour, and each side will get 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

"ILLEGAL" WAR AND THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to watch Kofi Annan, the United Nations Secretary General, address the U.N. delegates. I wish he had seen what we all witnessed a few minutes ago when the great Prime Minister Allawi from Iraq gave one of the best messages I have ever heard to a joint meeting.

Much has been made about the Secretary General's remarks in an interview last week in which he called the war in Iraq "illegal." Several of my colleagues, including Senator COLEMAN, have addressed this issue on the Senate floor, so I will not belabor the point. It is not an illegal war.

I would like to reemphasize that the liberation of Iraq was carried out to enforce Security Council resolutions. These were the serious consequences with which Saddam was threatened if he continued his illegal acts—his illegal acts.

Secretary General Annan's remarks seem to be based on the idea that without explicit Security Council permission, any military action is illegal under international law.

I remind my colleagues that in 1999, NATO forces had been conducting air operations in Kosovo for 72 days before the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution granting its blessings. I have not heard any condemnation of the NATO's action as being illegal.

Secretary General Annan's address centered on the rule of law. I want to read a brief excerpt of what he said. He said:

Yet today the rule of law is at risk around the world. Again and again, we see fundamental laws shamelessly disregarded—those that ordain respect for innocent life, for ci-

vilians, for the vulnerable—especially children.

To mention only a few flagrant and topical examples: In Iraq, we see civilians massacred in cold blood, while relief workers, journalists and other noncombatants are taken hostage and put to death in the most barbarous fashion. At the same time, we have seen Iraqi prisoners disgracefully abused.

That is what the Secretary General said.

I am not going to suggest that the abuses of Abu Ghraib prison were not wrong. They were wrong. I will say more about that in a minute.

My point is the Secretary General, by lumping these two things together, has put terrorists and insurgents on the same level as America. This is a fundamental difference between a nation that recognizes the rule of law and punishes its own citizens if they violate it, and groups of outlaws whose charter is written in blood and whose tactics solely rely on violations of the rule of law. The people of the United States should know this, and so should the Secretary General.

The instances of prisoner abuse that have received so much media attention during the past few months were violations of these standards. A handful of the violators were already being punished. It was already taking place long before the media frenzy took place.

America had to deal with Americans violating the rule of law, and it has done so head on. But I suggest the United Nations itself is not above the rule of law. We are just now beginning to learn how the United Nations allowed the U.N. Oil for Food Program to degenerate into little more than another source of income for Saddam Hussein's bloody regime.

The U.N. response to allegations of wrongdoing has been half-hearted at best. Is this the rule of law trumpeted by the Secretary General? Let's be clear. A country's adhering to the rule of law does not mean that its citizens will not do bad things. We must do everything we can to prevent such occurrences, but despite our best efforts or the best efforts in any country, it is not going to be totally successful.

People are, well, only human. We know that. The rule of law is borne out in identifying, condemning, and punishing those who violate the standards on which we all agree. This is exactly what we do in America.

The U.N. states a commitment to the rule of law. We will continue to work with other nations in this international forum to effect change for the better. But I and many of my colleagues share skepticism as to whether the U.N. can effectively realize its noble goals. If the past is any indication, we can expect a lot of talk and very little action.

In Iraq, we are fulfilling, to quote the Secretary General, "our responsibility to protect innocent civilians from genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes." If this is not the rule of law, I would like to know what it is.

All the criticisms the Secretary General was aiming at the United States

were refuted directly or indirectly by Iraqi Prime Minister Allawi when he spoke to our joint meeting. I am overwhelmed by it, and certainly hope the Secretary General also heard his greatly, profound remarks.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I have a brief inquiry. My understanding is that with the unanimous consent agreement, I will now have longer than 10 minutes, if I need it, to speak in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

AMERICA HAS A STRONG ALLY IN IRAQ

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his comments. I want to talk about several issues, but let me say with regard to the whole question of illegal status of the freedom we are winning, along with the Iraqi people, in Iraq, there are many people in the international community for whom the definition of "international legality" is quite flexible, depending upon what it is they happen to want at any particular moment.

I was serving in the Congress, albeit on the other side of the Capitol, in the 1990s and remember when, at the urgent request of the Europeans, particularly the western Europeans, the United States assembled a coalition and used its military power to prevent genocide in southeastern Europe, to protect the Kosovars from genocide that was being conducted by Milosevic and the Serbs at the time.

The nations that wanted to do that asked the Security Council for a resolution of support and were denied it because, if you will recall, Mr. President, the Russians threatened to veto it, just as the French indicated 2 years ago they would veto any resolution of support for our action in Iraq.

Now you would think that to be consistent with the position they are now taking, some of the Western European countries, in particular the French and Germans, would have said at the time, If you can't get a Security Council resolution, then we don't want to intervene in Kosovo and prevent genocide there. But that was not the position they took at all. They insisted, they urgently pleaded with the United States to lead a coalition of nations to intervene for humanitarian reasons at that point, notwithstanding the fact they could not get a Security Council resolution because they recognized then what we have been consistent in recognizing all along: That we always seek the support of international alliances, and we have support of an international coalition in Iraq. We always seek to operate within international bodies and get the support of the U.N. when possible, but we protect our freedom with or without the support of that body in any given circumstance.